U.S. Law vs. Obama's Unnatural Citizenship

U.S. Constitution; Article 1, Section 2, Clause 5:
"No person except a natural born citizen,...shall be eligible to the office of the President,..."

By the clear and irrefutable wording of Senate Res. 522 in 2008 John McCain is a natural born citizen and is such due to a certain fact which met the requirement of a certain principle. That fact is that he was born to citizens of America. That principle is the only principle that produces natural born citizens. By that principle, Barack Obama is not a natural born citizen nor a natural native of America but is instead merely a statutory citizen thanks to his connection to an American mother.

But with a foreign father his citizenship is not normal nor natural. Nothing that is not normal is natural because that which is unnatural is not normal. It is not normal or natural for a dog to produced off-spring with a cat, nor is normal and natural citizenship produced by the union of two different nationalities.

The dual-nationality of the off-spring is not normal nor politically natural. It is instead a hybrid political phenomenon that's akin to the racial duality of crossing an Eskimo with an African. A natural member of either group cannot possibly result. In the realm of dog breeds, one could use the example of crossing a great Dane with a Chihuahua. Whatever the result might be, it wouldn't be a natural representative of either breed.

Under the principle by which McCain was unanimously recognized as being born a natural citizen of the United States, Obama should and can be recognized as NOT being a natural citizen because he lacked an American father, - his mother was supposedly married to a visa card foreigner. His American citizenship is totally dependent on a U.S. statute that is the descendant of the Cable Act of 1922, -by which he was allowed to assume the citizenship of his American mother after she divorce his foreign father, -provided that he lived in the U.S. a prescribed number of years during his teens. Thus, he qualified for provisional citizenship when his mother and father obtained a divorce from a marriage for which there remains no evidence of any sort.

[There was a time (most of U.S. history) when a child born to an unwed American mother and a foreign father might be a stateless person, having no recognized nationality.]

Without that naturalization statute Obama would not be an American citizen under United States law, even though he would be considered as such by the erroneous policy adhered to by the ignorant U.S. State Department and INS, -a policy adopted by the U.S. Attorney General in 1899 after he misconstrued the Supreme Court ruling regarding the meaning of the words of the 14th Amendment (U.S. vs Wong Kim Ark).

The Supreme Court grossly re-interpreted the meaning of the amendment written three decades earlier, and then the A.G. re-interpreted their re-interpretation, producing the erroneous interpretation that in effect declared that only half of the amendment's words had any serious meaning, -the half that required a foreign-fathered child be born within U.S. sovereign territory.

The half that neither he nor the court understood was that which required that the father be fully subject to the authority of Washington. Without understanding what that really means, their interpretation could not be anything other than seriously flawed.

What it means is regarding whether or not a foreign (non-citizen) immigrant (male) is subject to being forced to fight for his new nation or is exempt from that responsibility of citizenship. The amendment states:

"All persons born in the United States, or naturalized, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the state wherein they reside."

Since no one fully understood the meaning of the jurisdiction requirement they were unable to interpret it correctly.

Once the court ruled that an immigrant's U.S. born children were citizens, then the executive branch backward engineered that ruling to mean that the child was subject to federal authority.

Since children aren't directly subject to the federal government, it followed that they were subject indirectly though their father being subject. Previously, since the founding of the republic, the government position had been that immigrants were not subject to the full authority of Washington D.C., but if their children were being in effect declared to be subject, then it followed that they were subject through a father that is subject.

If an immigrant father is subject then he can be drafted and forced to fight in America's wars. That then became the law of the land, and immigrants (like their American-born children) ever since faced being forced against their will to serve in the U.S. military or being incarceration in a federal penitentiary as lawful punishment for refusing, -just as if they were U.S. citizens.

But the question at the heart of the eligibility question isn't about the principle by which Obama is a U.S. citizen (since there is no such principle); the question is "By what principle is John McCain a natural born U.S. citizen?" Answer that question [natural conveyance from citizen parents] and the problem of Obama's ineligibility will be clearly revealed.

Other pertinent questions are; "What is Obama's native country?" -and "What is John McCain's native country?" The answer is that one's native country is that of their father, (or parents). Since at the time the Constitution was written women were viewed as the property of their father (unless they were a spinster) -living under his roof, bearing his name and nationality, if they married a foreigner then they became his "property" and took his name and lived under his roof, taking also his nationality since they were "one" -meaning "one and the same" as a unit (one could only have one country, and that is the country of the father's or the husband's nationality.

Wives and children derived their nationality from the head of the household, -the father. Thus, in the traditional sense, Kenya is Obama's "native-country".

It should be noted that in today's world, though some born with a foreign parent, or born abroad, come into this world with dual-citizenship, not all dual-citizenship is identical. Foreign citizenship conferred upon a natural citizen of the United States by a foreign nation due to birth on their soil is irrelevant to the dual-citizenship that comes from having a foreigner for a father. That form of dual-citizenship is impossible when both parents are Americans.

No natural citizen has ever had a foreigner for a father though millions of non-natural "legal citizens" have. Their citizenship is by the acquiescence of the federal government via constitutional, statutory and judicial law, while the citizenship of natural citizens exists in the absence of any law whatsoever. It requires no law because it is a natural unalienable right.

From Wikipedia:

The Cable Act of 1922 (ch.411, 42 Stat. 1021), is a United States federal law that reversed former immigration laws regarding marriage. Previously, (since 1907) a woman lost her U.S. citizenship if she married a foreign man, since she assumed the citizenship of her husband—a law that did not apply to men who married foreign women.

Former immigration laws prior to 1922 did not make reference to the alien husband's race.

[1] However, The Cable Act of 1922 guaranteed independent female citizenship only to women who were married to "alien[s] eligible to naturalization".
[2] At the time of the law's passage, Asian aliens were not considered to be racially eligible for U.S. Citizenship.
[3][4] As such, the Cable Act only partially reversed previous policies, granting independent female citizenship only to women who married non-Asians. The Cable Act effectively revoked the U.S. citizenship of any woman who married an Asian alien.
[Question: Was the Cable Act unconstitutional since it wasn't an amendment?]

"The Cable Act had additional limitations: A woman could keep her US citizenship if she stayed

within the United States, however, if she married a foreigner and lived on foreign soil, for as much as two years, she could still lose her right to U.S. nationality."

"The general doctrine [Doctrine is NOT law] is that no persons can by any act of their own, without the consent of the government, put off their allegiance, and become aliens."
[That is irrelevant to loss of citizenship via statute.]

Later court opinions on the matter are also irrelevant to the practice and policy of the government when the Constitution was written and ratified. At that time an American woman (like Ann Dunham) could not convey U.S. citizenship to her off-spring while married to a foreigner who was not a citizen, -especially one who was not even an immigrant.

There was an INS naturalization statute by which that was possible in 1961 (as well as now) though it applied only to foreign births to American women and foreign men. Since Obama was ostensibly born in Hawaii, that statute didn't apply to him. He therefore did not have U.S. citizenship conveyed to him at birth through his mother or his father.

Since the 14th Amendment didn't apply to the circumstances of Obama's supposed Hawaiian birth, -with its requirement of subjection to U.S. jurisdiction (applicable only through *immigrant* fathers) he was therefore born solely as a provisional subject of Kenya and the British Commonwealth. Barack Obama was not a United States citizen by birth. He was a British subject only.

But no one will confirm that fact, nor prove it wrong because the entire government is complicit in a conspiracy of silence about Obama's citizenship because if he was not born as an American, nor born as a natural American citizen, then he sure as hell was not born being constitutionally eligible to be the President.

Everyone just rolled over and accepted the seeming social good of having America led by the first person of color regardless of whether or not he was constitutionally eligible, or competent, or experienced, and not a product of **affirmative action** promotion by wealthy socialists.

by a.r. nash 2012 http://obama--nation.com